# *Management Training and Economics Education Project (MTEEP)*

# *Monitoring and Evaluation Services Contract*
# *Contract No. DHR-0029-C-00-5059-00*

# *Proceedings for Project Directors' Meeting November 6-7, 1995*

**Hosted by:**
**Datex, Inc.**
**2101 Wilson Blvd.**
**Suite 100**
**Arlington, VA 22201**

# FORWARD

This working session of the Project Directors involved in the USAID Management Training and Economics Education Project represents the beginning of an enduring, collaborative partnership between the Datex, Inc. evaluation team and the Project Directors.

During this meeting, the group made significant progress in refining a new evaluation methodology that will identify and measure program impact and efforts towards creating self-sustaining institutions.  We see this process as one that will evolve as the projects mature, and we welcomed this first opportunity for feedback and discussion.

The evaluation process can simply write projects' "obituaries" or it can coach projects towards their potential.  Coaching requires a much different relationship with grantees than that of obituary writer -- a relationship built on trust.  We intend to earn that trust from both USAID and the MTEE grantees through our demonstrated commitment to open dialogue, our familiarity with the regions and the projects' past histories, and our skill with people.

Given the fine work of the project directors and the evaluation team at this working session, we have high expectations for this new relationship.  The evaluation team is already busy preparing for the next working session scheduled for May, 1996.   May the productive nature of this working session characterize the efforts to come.

Leslie Koltai
Datex Project Manager

## Table of Contents

# MTEEP Project Directors Meeting
# Monday - Tuesday, November 6 - 7, 1995

## I. Introduction

The Project Directors' Meeting for the Management Training and Economics Education Project (MTEEP) was organized and hosted by Datex, Inc., the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) contractor, in order to bring all of the U.S.-based project participants together. The purpose of the meeting was to familiarize the project grantees, USAID personnel and the M&E team with each other. A primary objective was to further develop and refine the evaluation system that will be used throughout this project period to monitor and assess the success of the grantee programs. Another objective was to inform and update all of the project participants on the USAID reengineering and project management process. The full Project Directors' Meeting Agenda is included in Attachment A.

MTEEP is a USAID project that aims to develop technical, management, and economic skills necessary to reconstruct Central European economies and to develop competitive markets and businesses. Twelve U.S. institutions of higher education now partner with educational institutions in a geographical area expanded to include the Baltic States. The programs provide technical assistance to develop self-sustaining, high quality, management training and economics education programs through *Centers of Excellence.* The Centers provide a variety of programs including faculty training, small and medium business management training, and advanced degree programs.

The meeting was attended by representatives from eleven (11) of the twelve (12) grantees, USAID personnel, the monitoring and evaluation team and other Datex personnel (see List of Attendees in Attachment B). The meeting provided an opportunity for everyone to learn about the various programs. Reference material on the Central and Eastern European Area was contributed by Luba Fajfer, a member of the M&E team; several grantees provided materials, including case studies, concerning their projects. All of these materials were made available for distribution, as requested.

## II. USAID's Reengineering and the MTEEP Project

Dr. Carolyn Coleman, Director, USAID ENI/HR/TE, gave an overview of the status of reengineering within USAID at the mission and the Bureau levels. USAID is engaged in a total agency reengineering effort to focus its efforts on strategic objectives promoting "sustainable development...and economic and social growth [that] does not exhaust local resources or damage the economic, cultural or natural environment." The basic concepts underlying reengineering were outlined and the current attitudes of USAID personnel as well as the progress that is being made were presented.

The MTEEP project is part of a larger strategic objective for Europe and the New Independent States, including the Baltics, to develop competitive, market-oriented economies in which the majority of economic development resources are privately owned and managed. Dr. Coleman specifically noted the ways in which the reengineering process, as well as the previous policies and procedures, have and will affect the MTEEP grants and the project.

A. Reengineering

Dr. Coleman elaborated that one of the main objectives of reengineering is to eliminate the steps in project management, contracting, procurement, and every other area as well, that do not add value. Everyone within USAID has realized that it is time to "break the mold." Whenever this is attempted, however, it generates a lot of uncertainty. There is also a certain level of skepticism since there have been many prior attempts at reorganization that have not effected much substantive change.

Through reengineering, USAID is looking very carefully at what it does and how it does it. The big question for rules, procedures and operations is, "so what?"

B. Managing for Results

USAID was started as a temporary agency, and at first did not recognize a need for evaluation. With longevity came the need to document and understand results and successes to better transfer successful strategies from one program to another.

The Agency is becoming more entrepreneurial, and as a result is studying how the private sector works. Two focus areas for reengineering, derived from the private sector, are customer focus and teamwork.

I. Within customer focus, the customer/client is defined as the recipient of the services, the end user. Congress serves as a stakeholder, not a client.

ii. The teamwork focus includes all of the active participants in an effort (including Datex and the grantees for MTEEP). The teamwork focus of the reengineering effort considers the satisfaction and participation of all stakeholders as vital and inherently linked to the project's success. As such, the stakeholders are all part of the evaluation process as well. For each evaluation, more issues than just project, contractor and grantee performance are considered. The level and quality of support provided by USAID is also considered.

C. Budget Issues

Another changing element in the reengineering environment is that the Missions now make many more, if not all, of the budgetary distribution decisions. The Missions get to allocate their funding within their own competing priorities, as opposed to having these mandated by Washington.

At the time of this meeting, the budget for USAID was down 17-18% this year once inflation and the budget for Israel & Egypt is taken into consideration. As a result, everyone within the

Agency will feel the effect at least somewhat. In addition, other priorities such as aid to Mexico City and humanitarian assistance around the world influence Agency allocations in ways that are beyond the control of the individual Missions and Bureaus.

For the NIS and Eastern Europe there is a new budget coordinator at USAID. As an indication of what this person will be facing, the Coordinator for the State Department has already stated that his job is to find $10 million to redirect. Dr. Coleman believes that the training function may be perceived by others as expendable when budget challenges emerge and in fact knows that some training efforts have already been questioned within the Department of State. There is some concern that the same questions could be raised for efforts in Europe by USAID.

D. General Conclusions and Discussion Topics During Direct Questioning

Dr. Coleman opened up the floor for a question and answer discussion session, following her overview of USAID reengineering. The conclusions reached and issues raised during this session are summarized below:

- There will not be a shift toward a regional focus for projects because the funding will continue to go to the Missions, which have individual country agendas.

- The SEED Act legislation talked about 3 main program areas[1], and initially USAID decided to give all three equal priority. These now have been prioritized, with "quality of life" given lesser priority.

- The MTEEP Project is probably not threatened by any budget negotiations. The USAID country representatives should have worked out each grantee's life of project (LOP) budget so that each has enough funds to complete their project. There is a potential that funds may not later be available, but the country representatives have done everything that they can to avoid that.

- While there appear to be some current halts and stalls in shifting responsibility and authority for decision-making from USAID/W to the field, momentum is going to continue to place decision making authority in the field with respect to budget and programs. Last year was difficult on the grantees due to the fact that there were joint budgetary decisions being made between USAID/W and the Missions. But the impetus will remain to keep decisions in the field.

- The coordination of the communication and the interaction among the virtual teams of Washington and the field is still evolving. A lot of communication has had to take place in writing. Because of budget reductions, D.C. staff is not traveling much. As a result relationships are more difficult to establish and strengthen.

- The reengineering process appears to be going well, but "going well" is a relative term. The proof will be in the implementation and in achieving results.

- USAID is implementing MRS (Management Reporting System), a centralized database that will be able to show what has been accomplished. It is being used more in the field than in Washington. Some USAID personnel and offices are trained in its use, some are not, so it is not integrated yet. Reengineering was supposed to have kicked off on Oct. 1, but that hasn't happened. There will be frustrations because there is not consistency yet in what data the grantees are being asked to collect and present.

- Although grantee concern about the effect from a lack of a baseline for the evaluations is valid, this is something that the evaluation teams and USAID are well aware of and adjustments in the evaluations will be made. However, one cannot hold off evaluating because there is a lack of a baseline, otherwise there will never be a baseline or an evaluation.

**III. MTEEP Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Organization and Expectations**

---

[1] These are: (1) The development of a market economy and strong private sector; (2) the development and strengthening of institutions necessary for sustainable democracy; and (3) the improvement of the basic quality of life in selected areas (1992 SEED Act Implementation Report).

A panel discussed the nature, organizational structure, and expectations of the monitoring and evaluation component of the MTEE Project from the perspective of each of the stakeholders: USAID, the grantees, and Datex. Mary Ann Zimmerman, Datex Senior Evaluator, served as the Moderator for this session. The other three panel members were John Batelle, USAID Project Officer, Henry (Buddy) Enck, Project Director for Central Connecticut State University, and Dr. Leslie Koltai, Datex Project Manager.

A. John Batelle, USAID Project Officer

Mr. Batelle opened up his presentation with a brief history of MTEEP. The program started in 1991 with a mandate to deliver a regional MTEE program in Central Europe. At that point the Agency thought that USAID would be in Eastern Europe for 5 years. It has become apparent that they will be there longer, at least in certain countries. At the start of the project, they focused on the northern tier countries. Interest and funding are now shifting to the southern tier. There are also some changes in the air in Hungary with the Communist party being elected to Congress, however this situation doesn't hold the same kind of national security implications that it did a few years ago.

With the Clinton administration, and reengineering, the focus has shifted from studying the implementation process to reporting on and replicating results. With the numerous changes with this administration, Mr. Batelle will be trying to maintain as much consistency as possible.

The former USAID Project Officer had a very macro-oriented management style. He wanted people to work within their own country and with the USAID representatives. Mr. Batelle feels that his style is similar. He believes that one cannot run a successful development project from Washington. As a result, it is critical to work with counterpart institutions and USAID in country.

Under prior grants, USAID placed a lot of emphasis on measuring success through student contact hours. It is now time for everyone to look beyond the process and the numbers to the results. Another factor is that the various CEE training projects could start to become combined. For this evaluation contract, Mr. Batelle has asked Datex to come up with an evaluation system that dovetails with the participant training evaluations. These are new grants. There is a new evaluation contractor. And so this is a good time to get this off the ground.

Poland can serve as an example. The Mission has set its goals and identified local expertise. USAID/Warsaw actually ran its own RFP evaluation process and let the grants from Warsaw. However, it was difficult for some grantees adjust to this particular management style. Something for the grantees and USAID to remember is that there is very little that USAID/W can ask from the grantees because they are doing this almost all on their own. This is why Mr. Batelle reasserted that he has asked for the minimum required of the grantees. He summarized the following reporting requirements and arrangements with Datex:

- Each grantee is required to submit quarterly reports. It is in the grantees' best interests to make these reports as strong as possible, to document successes and issues.
- All grantees should send a copy of the quarterly report to Datex. Datex has agreed to work with USAID and the grantees to develop an appropriate, uniform format.
- USAID requires that the report include participation numbers, including a breakdown of participants by gender; and financial information.2
- The quarter should be determined by the government's fiscal year. Right now everyone should be in the first quarter of FY 96 (Oct.-Dec., 1995).
- USAID agreed that all 4th quarterly report information may be included in the annual report.

B. Henry (Buddy) Enck, Project Director, Central Connecticut State University, working in Poland

Buddy Enck discussed the roles and responsibilities under this project from the point of view of a grantee. He stated that, minimally, the relationship with the evaluators should not be combative and that, in fact, the evaluators can serve as a sounding board for grantees' problems. Because these programs consist of technical assistance as a catalyst for market transformation, a serious need in these regions, grantees ought to be held to a high standard. The evaluators have a right to expect a great deal. Grantees should be expected to exercise due diligence in selecting their partners and devising realistic programs that work. If they do not do so, then they should have to answer to the taxpayers through USAID and its evaluators.

Dr. Enck expects the evaluation process to recognize the contexts in which the projects are

---

The form that this financial reporting should take is being negotiated with USAID/W and several USAID missions as their requirements vary.

working. For example, in Poland, where Dr. Enck is working, are the kinds of local peculiarities that USAID and the evaluators need to consider. Despite these barriers, grantees have a right to expect the American work ethic from the people in country that they are working with, at times in spite of local attitudes. These grants are not intended as gifts, but a resource to achieve their purposes. It is the job of the grantees to convince the partners that the money is a means, not an end.

Mr. Enck discussed the fact that USAID does not have a very good reputation in the current political climate in some of the CEE countries. To develop positive local support, the grantees should aggressively pursue positive press coverage of their work. The host countries and the grantees must understand that these projects cannot act solely in an academic environment. Each grantee must work to develop the regions in which they work.

The grantees also have an obligation to ask a great deal of their partners. It is incumbent upon the grantees to choose wisely who receives training, and ask themselves, "how is the public purpose being fulfilled?" with each planning meeting. Ultimately, the public purpose is best met when these projects create self-sustaining institutions. One mistake some programs make is to build the sustainability of a program on the good will of a single local staff member or rector, and when that person leaves, the program flounders. Instead, grantees must ensure that a program is embedded in an institution, otherwise it will not last.

Dr. Enck urged USAID to make better use of the expertise represented by US project staff, noting that the grantees know as much if not more than USAID does about the countries in which they are working.

Finally, Dr. Enck noted that it is very helpful, if not essential for the grantees to have the evaluation system ahead of time, so that they know what information is needed. Compiling data after the fact is time consuming and often difficult.

C. Dr. Leslie Koltai, Project Manager, Datex, Inc.

Dr. Koltai discussed the areas of emphasis for the monitoring and evaluation contract, and urged everyone to understand the reengineering context within which USAID is reorganizing.

The challenge for Datex is to evaluate the work of the grantees under the new USAID environment and evaluation requirements. Given the length of this project (2 - 5 years), the evaluation process will continue to be formative and summative. Summative evaluation is the relatively easy part. A summative evaluation is much like an obituary: it documents a project's performance after the fact. Formative evaluation is the challenge, and it is much more like monitoring. Formative evaluation involves regularly comparing a project's activities to date with its goals, analyzing why progress is or is not being made, and making mid-course corrections when needed.

The evaluation process must look at the skills that the grantees are teaching and the effects of these skills on the participants. Further, the evaluation depends on the grantee input. The evaluators are not going to succeed without this input, and the grantees' understanding of the tools and the methodology. Grantees must know what the evaluators are doing, and they must take a vested interest in the tools and instruments.

Dr. Koltai discussed the steps and tools that the evaluation teams will make use of.

I. Document review. The evaluators review everything the grantees write, so it is very important that all of the relevant documents are supplied. The grantees need to tell the evaluators what kinds of evaluation questions will help them, and what indicators would be most useful.

ii. Observation and the Site Visits. These are extremely important. The site visits give the evaluators the texture and the taste of the programs. For example, the evaluation teams want to know what the community thinks of the programs. Interviews will be held with Project Directors, employers, participants, business leaders, and others who are either indirectly impacted by the program, or who could assist the program (for example, local businesses and local government). Site visits also provide the evaluators with a sense of local context -- the barriers and support within which the project is taking root. As these site visits occur in a short period of time, it is extremely important that the grantees assist the teams by lining up the interviews that will do this.

iii. Questionnaires. Dr. Koltai noted that no one likes filling out forms, however, questionnaires provide everyone with consistent, regular information. He asked that the grantees be sure that they glean the following bits of information from the questionnaires before sending them on to Datex: Do they know the results of their own questionnaires? Do they know where their strengths are? Do they know how they are perceived by their participants? Questionnaires can assess three areas: environment, planning and logistics. Dr. Koltai confirmed that the teams would, as part of the formative process, share early findings, derived from the questionnaires, with grantees.

iv. Development of a database. This system will emerge as Datex determines the specific data needs, sources, and uses for it.

Dr. Koltai stressed that the project's success depends on the extent to which everyone works together -- including how well the evaluation team and the grantees respond to one another. As the evaluation team has made a commitment to share early drafts of comments with the grantees, grantees have a responsibility to read the drafts, and to respond. The formative evaluations are the guiding tools for improved project implementation, and are an excellent learning tool.

The grantees inquired whether it would be useful to take some case studies and develop some "success stories." USAID's response was that the quarterly reports are the opportunity and the vehicle for the grantees to address issues, as well as to document successes. The reports have to outline what the problems are as well. USAID does not have any way, otherwise, of assisting the grantees in addressing those problems and issues.

D. John Batelle, Project Officer, speaking for Barbara Brocker, Contracting Officer

Barbara Brocker, the MTEEP Contracting Officer was unable to attend the meeting. To address some of the issues related to contracting and administrative issues, John Batelle spoke on her behalf, to the extent that he felt qualified. He addressed many areas related to the grantee contracts and the funding and payment process.

For example, the grantees raised concerns about the payment and funding process. Mr. Batelle stated that he works to get all of the funding and payment documents processed along to the point where, if there is a delay, it is only because there is no money available. When the money does get appropriated to USAID, the grantees should be contacted by someone in the Office of Procurement, probably Elaine Smialek, within 4-6 weeks. As a frame of reference, last year the money for these grants was appropriated on December 15. The current funding status is that the specific budgets for these programs are accounted for, as the budgets have already been negotiated with the posts. The issue now is when the money will be released to USAID. The 1996 money should be distributed in late January, 1996, or early February.

Mr. Batelle noted that several Agency-wide issues, that will affect the grantees, have come down to the Bureaus and Missions:

1. *Participation of women:* Gender participation rates have become very important. USAID would like projects to achieve a 50% female participation rate. This project has been running at about 30%. Some grantees expressed concern over the inherent difficulty meeting USAID's goals for female participation in many of the MTEEP countries. Mr. Batelle responded that USAID acknowledges that there are certain challenges and constraints, inherent in the countries, to increasing women's participation. However, USAID is encouraging the grantees to be creative and to work hard in this area. When the country's social or economic context is particularly limiting to female participation, grantees need to make that clear to the evaluators. The evaluation team understands the historical context, but they still want to be sure that the grantees are not limiting themselves in their efforts to equalize participation.

2. *Centralized data collection:* The local PIET office is primarily responsible for participant training; however, it is also responsible for entering data into the Participant Training Management System (PTMS). The system will probably be expanded to enter data on almost all USAID-funded training, including the MTEE project. Mr. Batelle has asked Datex to develop a way for the MTEE grantees to gather data on their programs such that this information can be entered into the PTMS program. Ideally, PIET could be used to enter the data, although initially the grantees may want to do this themselves. Datex will discuss the PTMS project with the grantees both at this conference and during site visits. The inclusion of MTEE data is in the experimental stage at the moment.

3. *Utilizing HBCUs:* USAID encourages the creation of linkages with HBCUs. If there is

any such potential, please try and pursue it. Mr. Batelle understands that there was no talk of this on the grants or the RFAs, however, it is still a priority for the Agency and pursuit of this objective is encouraged.

4. *Sustainability*: If there is a sustainable program there is going to be impact. Sustainability is a benchmark for success and is a clear goal of USAID. Therefore, these projects will be scrutinized for their ability to develop programs that can stand by themselves without additional U.S. assistance.

A contracting issue was raised regarding any alternatives the grantees may have to facilitate the purchase and distribution of equipment, such as computers. One method could be to purchase equipment outside of the U.S. However, the Office of Procurement needs a waiver to allow for any alteration in the source-origin procurement requirements. The previous Deputy Assistant Administrator was not interested in giving these waivers. However, the current DAA is new and his views are unknown.

Another contracting issue clarified was the issue of compensation for host country institutions and faculty. It is against regulations to use U.S. funds to compensate another host country's staff. Since most of the local faculty involved in MTEEP are government employees, compensating them with USAID funds is difficult.

To clarify the need for country clearances, Mr. Batelle requested that the grantees work with their in-country USAID representative on clearances. However, he is required to have a copy of the clearance for audit purposes. Further, if grant money is to be used to finance any portion of a visit to the country, even if the travel was requested and initiated under a different activity, clearance should still be obtained.

## IV. The MTEEP Proposed Monitoring and Evaluation System

### A. Summary of the M&E System

Throughout this session the three Senior Evaluators presented and explained the draft monitoring and evaluation methodology. The session was moderated by Dr. Melora Sundt, with Mary Ann Zimmerman and Luba Fajfer presenting various elements of the system. A copy of the draft methodology is in Attachment C.

Formative and summative evaluation reports are required by USAID from Datex. The evaluators want to collect information, related to individual projects and to the group as a whole, that has some meaning. The desire is then to present it in a format and in a language that will be understood outside of the USAID environment, as well as to develop useful lessons that apply to all MTEE projects, even with such diversity. The purpose of the first site visits by the evaluation teams is to pilot the materials and see what is likely to work, how well it is working, etc.

The success of this project is affected by variables beyond the control of the individual programs.

Aside from these variables, there are also constraints, related to the evaluation process, which limit the evaluation teams' effectiveness.

Developing the indicators for impact is one of the most substantial tasks facing the evaluators, and one of the most sensitive. The assumptions used to develop indicators of impact must factor in an appropriate time frame. For example, the result of the training of some MBA students may not be seen until the graduates take a leadership role many years later. The indicators that they have identified to date are laid out in the M&E Methodology (Attachment C). It is also useful to identify what unsuccessful programs would look like (often not simply the inverse of a successful program), and so the presentation reviewed descriptors of both successful and unsuccessful programs. From these descriptors, indicators were proposed. The grantees were given the opportunity to discuss these on the second day of the meeting. Those conclusions are presented in section *IV.D. Summary Reports from the Small Groups.*

In the draft methodology, impact is described as occurring in four levels: acquisition, satisfaction, utilization, and change. On the sustainability level, the evaluators propose looking at three categories to determine how well a project is moving towards being self-sustaining: programmatic, organizational and financial.

Information gathering techniques were presented. The document gathering and analysis will be from research/personal libraries, grantee materials and reports, host institution materials, USAID materials (local and Washington), documents available on the Internet, and the press.

The evaluators also reminded the grantees that the material that was gathered from all of the previous questionnaires still exists, is functioning, and is accessible for anyone who wants that information.

B. Discussion

- *Pre and Post testing:* To date, pre- and post-tests have not been required due to the administrative burden they place on grantees. However, some of the individual grantees, for example Central Connecticut State University and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, report having initiated these on their own. Datex is available to confer with grantees on setting up such a system. USAID made it clear, however, that the results of pre- and post-tests focus on the quality of the training, which is relevant only as it leads to an understanding of a program's impact. The outcome, and the effects of the training on the participants' lives, are important to USAID.

- *Definition of Success:* A concern of the grantees was that some of the indicators appear to be beyond the direct control of the grantees. For example, local management of a program is part of USAID's definition of a self-sustaining program. However, some programs may want to include international and/or external funding. Further, sometimes the most highly qualified people for the programs may be international. Some programs will never be fully independent, and will remain collaborative. The Datex team acknowledged that "success" involves financial independence from *this grant*, not other sources of funding, and that collaboration was valued so long as indigenous institutions were the end product.

- *Charging tuition and feeds:* USAID wondered how the tuition fees for certain programs have been established and determined. Grantees responded that, for short courses, it is usually established by the market. For longer courses, the grantees make a determination of what people will pay. Tuition will be a key issue for the grantees as academic programs evolve, as for many of the full-time, day academic programs, tuition is not legally permitted.

- *Comparison to competitors:* The evaluation team plans to examine how the programs are doing in comparison with other similar programs sponsored by other donors, especially the Europeans. These competitors can serve as sources of information and bases of comparison.

- *Degree to which the evaluation process can be generalized for all projects:* Someone queried USAID and Datex as to how standardized the evaluation system has to be, and how it will meet the individualized evaluation needs of the different programs. The evaluators responded that at this point they are developing the generic process that can then be tailored to each specific grantee and program. The specific evaluation indicators will be based on these initial assumptions, indicators, information sources, etc., but then they will be refined and specified according to the scopes of work and the country contexts. The evaluators' first upcoming site visits will serve to speak with the Missions and the people in the field and to bounce these assumptions and the methodology of the M&E system off of everyone.

- *Developing strategic objectives:* One opportunity that the grantees have is to become involved in the development of their Mission's strategic objectives. At the Mission level, each of the countries will be taking their strategic objectives and developing training and documentation plans to monitor their progress towards achieving their goals. The grantees should let their USAID representatives know that they would like to participate in the development of this plan, particularly since Missions will assess all of their programs against the indicators in these documents.

C. Project Director Small Group Discussions

The second day of the Project Directors' Meeting was spent refining and clarifying the Monitoring and Evaluation Methodology. The Project Directors broke into three small groups to independently discuss several questions raised by the evaluation team. Ron Oppen, Project Director for SUNY-Office of International Programs, served as the moderator for this session. Each group had its own designated moderator, who was then tasked with returning to the large group at the end of the session to present findings and conclusions.

The three groups were determined by geographic location and the evaluators' site visit itineraries. Group A was moderated by Randy Zimmermann (University of Minnesota) and consisted of Central Connecticut State University (Poland), University of Minnesota (Poland), University of Maryland (Poland), and University of Pittsburgh (Czech Republic and Slovakia). Group B was moderated by Bob Tolar (Washington State University) and consisted of SUNY-OIP (Hungary), Indiana University (Hungary), and Washington State University (Romania). Group C was moderated by Larry Donnelley (University of Delaware) and consisted of the University of Delaware (Bulgaria), University of Nebraska-Lincoln (Albania), Texas A&M International (Lithuania), and SUNY-Buffalo (Latvia).

The tasks for the small groups consisted of the following:

1. Discuss the indicator issues particular to your group.
2. Determine common indicators across projects in your group.
3. Determine the desired level of specification (degree granting, certificate granting, etc.) for groupings for comparison.
4. Make suggestions for the unit (like student contact hours) of comparison that makes the most sense.
5. Make suggestions for the "demographic" data to be collected via PTMS data entry.

D. Summary Reports from the Small Groups

This session was perhaps the most critical activity undertaken throughout the meeting. One of the primary purposes of the Project Directors' Meeting was to discuss and review the methodology so that the evaluators would be able to revise it, incorporating the feedback from the people who are actually implementing the programs.

Each Group Moderator gave a summary presentation of the findings from their group, and then the floor was opened for general discussion of topics and issues that had been raised. Below are the significant discussion points, overall conclusions and agreements reached.

There were two conclusions common to all three groups.

1. Because of the differences in the projects and programs and the different methods of implementation, there is a need for more subjective, narrative analysis in the evaluation reports.

2. The Project Directors would appreciate receiving the evaluation reports in draft first, before the final versions, to ensure that everyone gets a better product.

Everyone agreed that each project has a large number of indicator issues that are particular to each project. Some of the common indicators for all of the projects can be developed around the types of activities being carried out such as: outreach, adult education, certificate and degree granting programs, executive management seminars, institutional strengthening activities, etc. The groups recommended that cross-project comparisons be limited to those similar in the level and degree of training, such as degree granting programs, certificate-granting programs, work shops and counseling/advising.

The overall suggestions for units of comparison was unanimously viewed as one of the most difficult questions. No one liked the previous standard of contact hours. The best option that people saw was "days of program exposure." The evaluation team agreed to continue to work with USAID on this issue.

What everyone agreed upon as most important, however, is for the grantees to be evaluated against what they said they were going to do. The team agreed that at least one measure of progress will be in reference to program goals. The team noted, however, that some grantees have vague goal statements that need "operationalizing" before they can be used as criteria of success. The Datex team volunteered to assist any project wanting help in developing clearer performance objectives.

To gather demographic data, the programs will need to be culturally sensitive to some groups' hesitancies in divulging personal information. The need for and use of the information will have to be clearly explained to participants.

Following this overall summary of the results of the small group discussions, each of the individual moderators gave a brief presentation of the specific points that were raised in their groups.

*Group A*

Indicators were a major topic of conversation. Many indicators are particular to individual projects. For example, training should be distinguished from technical assistance. Further, within a given activity, there are different stages, each needing different indicators. For example, faculty development often occurs in stages: the learning/exposure phase, the co-teaching phase, and the "teaching solo" phase. Measuring the numbers of new courses developed would be inappropriate for programs in the "learning/exposure" phase. These would be creating an impact on participants that could not be captured simply by counting the number of new courses developed.

The group also recommended that more indicators be developed to reflect the development of the partner institutions. In addition, aspects of the projects that are not directly linked to the training and education programs have to be addressed, in addition to the MBA programs, for example.

The group emphasized that attention has to be paid to the **context** of the programs. There are varying levels of country, school, and community involvement and receptivity, each affecting the ease with which a program impacts the community.

The surveys and questionnaires have to be tailored to the target audiences. The terms have to be translatable, in that the terms that are used have to mean comparable things in both languages. The measures of good and bad in the surveys and their indicators have to be consistent throughout. Questionnaires have to recognize the diversity of the participants, and make adjustments for the respondent groups, for example student groups or business groups.

The group supported the idea of developing some common indicators. All of the programs from this group engage in outreach, graduate management education (although with different levels), adult education certificate-granting training, and executive management workshops or seminars. As such, common indicators for these areas can be developed.

Everyone was in agreement that an "exposure day" unit for measurement is acceptable. However, the question was raised regarding technical assistance, specifically, how to classify non-classroom activities, instructional time vs. technical assistance.

For data collection, it is critical that the project directors are notified well in advance of data collection and reporting needs. It is also necessary to realize that the demographics of the programs aren't always determined by the grantees, especially if a company has contracted out for training or educational programs. The grantees need clarification on their responsibility for tracking their participants (especially after the activity), for how long, and at what level of detail.

*Group B*

The group was in accordance with the findings presented. There was a general feeling that somewhere between the impact level and the process level there could be a consideration of the programs' potential to lead to change. For impact, the impact on other students needs to also be added to questionnaires and taken into consideration. This would be in addition to the impact on co-workers, supervisors, etc.

*Group C*

The programs in this group are largely involved in outreach activities. For such activities, an additional indicator that the evaluators might want to track is the number of small businesses established. The group also stated a need to consider institutional strengthening activities, such as building libraries, in addition to the management programs.

One idea for the development of indicators is that each of the programs be evaluated against the targets that they originally proposed, and this "attainment level" be used as the basis for comparing the performance of projects against each other.

There was concern regarding the expectations for the individual collection of data and the format for the quarterly reports, especially in light of some of the expectations that were mentioned by Mr. Batelle the previous day.

E. Additional Discussions

The evaluators responded that the goal behind evaluation is to communicate impact and to make determinations of sustainability. If an evaluation tool isn't working, then it will be dropped or modified.

There has been a pervasive problem with the absence of comprehensive baseline data. This will be addressed in the narrative portions of the evaluation reports in order to have that fact acknowledged.

The evaluations will address the political and social environment of the projects, including the country's environment as well as the Mission's environment (degree of involvement and support, for example).

Grantees suggested that if USAID wants additional data collection, then grantee administrative costs will rise, and that will have to be worked into the budgets.

At the conclusion of this session, the evaluation team confirmed that, at some level, all of these projects get tracked and compared by USAID. The evaluation team can work collaboratively with the grantees to record their successes and, as an external observer, guide them towards their goals. The goal is not to create a "law enforcement" team, but a partnership whereby the evaluation team can validate a project's efforts, and trouble shoot with those who are not getting the results they expected. These benefits will emerge only if the grantees participate in the evaluation process.

## V. Participant Training Management System

Peter Gallagher of InfoStructure, who is working with the HERNS project, made a presentation to several of the interested Project Directors of the PTMS system that is used for the collection of the raw training data for USAID. The system has been used with other USAID projects, but has been limited to participant training models. Applying PTMS to the MTEE project would be the first time the system has been challenged to track "group" rather than "participant" data. Datex staff have been working with Mr. Gallagher to modify the data collection forms such that MTEE Project Directors will be able to report the usual demographic information that would appear in a quarterly report either by filling out one of these forms, or by entering the data directly into PTMS themselves and then submitting the diskette to USAID. The evaluation team hopes that by studying this system, and merging its reporting limitations with USAID's needs for this project, the team can simplify the grantees' reporting requirements and integrate the MTEE project into this centralized data collection system. In this climate of budget cutting, it is important that the MTEE program be represented in any centralized tracking system.

## VI. Concluding Remarks and Next Steps

There is a natural concern regarding the development of a common evaluation system for all of the programs. The next groups to review the methodology should be the partner institutions as they have been involved in the project design and implementation from the beginning, and are ultimately the ones who will direct the programs' success or failure.

The evaluators assured the grantees that after the site visit discussions, there will be another iteration of the methodology. The process is just that, a process, and the development of the methodology is collaborative and ongoing. The evaluation team will present draft indicators, tailored to each program, in its first quarterly report. Grantees will be sent a copy of the draft of their section prior to the submission of the report to USAID.  Datex asked grantees to respond promptly to its request for comments.

At the meeting's conclusion, everybody agreed that two things that are critical to a successful evaluation partnership: trust and communication between the grantees and the evaluators.  All agreed that this meeting was a good first step towards establishing this open relationship.

# DATEX, INC.
# MTEEP Project Directors' Orientation Meeting
# November 6-7, 1995

Monday, November 6, 1995

| Time | Topic | Presenter |
|---|---|---|
| 9:00 - 9:30 | Welcome/Introductions | Ajit Dutta<br>Leslie Koltai<br>John Batelle |
| 9:30 - 10:15 | USAID Re-Engineering and Discussion | Dr. Carolyn Coleman |
| 10:15 - 10:30 | Break | |
| 10:30 - 12:00 | MTEEP M & E Organization & Expectations/ Roles & Responsibilities<br>▸ USAID<br>▸ Datex Team<br>▸ Grantees and partners | Mary Ann Zimmerman - Moderator<br>John Batelle<br>Barbara Brocker<br>Buddy Enck<br>Les Koltai |
| 12:00 - 1:00 | Lunch<br>MTEEP Support and Communication<br>▸ Newsletter<br>▸ E-mail links<br>▸ Annual PD meeting<br>▸ Monthly communication | Barbara Rossmiller |
| 1:00 - 3:00 | Reports from Project Directors (maximum 7 mins each)<br>▸ Central Connecticut State Univ.<br>▸ Indiana University<br>▸ SUNY - OIP<br>▸ SUNY - Buffalo<br>▸ Texas A & M University<br>▸ Washington State University<br>▸ University of Delaware<br>▸ University of Maryland<br>▸ University of Minnesota<br>▸ University of Nebraska-Lincoln<br>▸ University of Pittsburgh | Dennis McConnell - Moderator |
| 3:00 - 3:15 | Break | |
| 3:15 - 5:00 | Monitoring & Evaluation System<br>▸ Purpose<br>▸ Indicators for sustainability and impact<br>▸ Data collection tools<br>▸ Reporting formats and time tables<br>▸ Access to data<br>▸ Role of site visits | Les Koltai - Moderator<br>Mary Ann Zimmerman<br>Melora Sundt<br>Luba Fajfer<br>Dennis McConnell |
| 6:00 | Reception, then Dinner on your own | |

Tuesday, November 7, 1995

| Time | Topic | Presenter |
|---|---|---|
| 9:00 - 10:30 | Comments on M & E system<br>‣ Small group discussion with reports to large group<br><br>Group 1:<br>University of Delaware<br>University of Nebraska - Lincoln<br>Texas A&M<br>SUNY - Buffalo<br>Group 2:<br>SUNY - OIP<br>Indiana University<br>Washington State University<br>Group 3:<br>Central Connecticut State University<br>University of Minnesota<br>University of Maryland<br>University of Pittsburgh | Ron Oppen - Moderator<br><br><br>Group 1 Moderator - Larry Donnelly<br><br><br><br>Group 2 Moderator - Bob Tolar<br><br><br>Group 3 Moderator - Randy Zimmermann |
| 10:30 - 10:45 | Break | |
| 10:45 - 12:00 | Large Group Discussion and Feedback from the small group session on the M&E methodology | Ron Oppen - Moderator |
| 12:00 - 1:00 | Lunch - Closing Remarks | Ajit S. Dutta<br>Dr. Leslie Koltai |
| 1:00- 3:00 | Meetings with Project Directors as needed<br>‣ PTMS Demonstration<br>‣ Site visit logistics meetings<br>‣ Other | |

**MTEEP Project Directors' Meeting**
***November 6-7, 1995***
***Hosted by: Datex, Inc.***

**LIST OF ATTENDEES:**

**USAID**
1. Carolyn Coleman, USAID/ENI/HR/TE
2. John Batelle, USAID/ENI/HR/TE
3. Kim Ayers, USAIDENI/HR/TE

**Grantees**
4. John Bloss, SUNY-OIP, Hungary
5. Larry Boyd, Texas A&M International University, Lithuania
6. Larry Donnelly, University of Delaware, Bulgaria
7. Buddy Enck, Central Connecticut State University, Poland
8. Bruce Jaffee, Indiana University, Hungary
9. Sang Lee, University of Nebraska - Lincoln, Albania
10. Jan Nersinger, SUNY-Buffalo, Latvia
11. Ron Oppen, SUNY-OIP, Hungary
12. Ursula Powidzki, University of Maryland, Poland
13. Lee Preston, University of Maryland, Poland
14. Stan Shumway, University of Delaware, Bulgaria
15. Jan Svejnar, University of Pittsburgh, Czech Republic and Slovakia
16. John Thomas, SUNY-Buffalo, Latvia
17. Bob Tolar, Washington State University, Romania
18. Randy Zimmermann, University of Minnesota, Poland

19. Peter Gallagher, InfoStructure, HRNS Project

**Datex, Inc.**
20. Ajit S. Dutta, Datex
21. Leslie Koltai, Datex
22. Melora Sundt, Datex
23. Luba Fajfer, Datex
24. Mary Ann Zimmerman, Datex
25. Dennis McConnell, Datex, Inc.
26. Barbara Rossmiller, Datex

MTEEP MONITORING & EVALUATION MODEL
For Review and Comment
10/25/95

There is no perfect way to evaluate a program's impact on a population. Each approach, tool and concept suffers from problems of definition, measurement or quantification, reliability and interpretation. Any approach represents a compromise: information is selected or ignored; what an evaluator selects is then subject to being highlighted or de-emphasized. The key to an effective evaluation process is to make informed compromises. Our goal is to provide the most useful, complete and accurate information and analyses possible, given our understanding of the program's objectives, cost and time constraints, and program cooperation/participation constraints. The methodological choices we made, our compromises, will be explained as they appear.

## Assumptions

To begin the evaluation process, we have to make several assumptions:

1. Transitioning a previously controlled economy to a market-driven economy is a positive change.
2. Exposure of academics and practitioners to Western theories of economics and management will support this transition, increasing the likelihood that it will occur faster and with less turmoil than had this exposure not occurred.
3. Short cycle education, technical training, curriculum revision and faculty development are effective ways to provide this exposure and facilitate the transition. Specifically, training leads to personal and professional growth, which affects organizational development, which contributes to institutional development, and leads eventually to socioeconomic growth (to paraphrase J. Gillies).
4. To be most effective, and as an indicator of their success, these interventions should either become self-sustaining (i.e., functioning without U.S. government funding) or become no longer necessary.
5. These interventions can and should be evaluated for the purposes of program improvement, with the criteria for evaluation being derived from USAID's goals for the program, and individual projects' stated objectives.

## Intervening Variables

The success of this project is affected by variables beyond the control of the individual programs. These variables include:

1. National privatization policies which are implemented (and change) independently of the training programs.
2. Turnover in government positions, mid-project, requiring new relationship building and orientation to the goals and accomplishments of the project.

3. Changes in the political climate, as a result of the pace with which the transition may (or may not) be taking place. These changes may result in local policy makers feeling dis-enfranchised by the process, and hostile towards U.S.-funded, capitalist-oriented projects.
4. Lack of (or slow to develop) national infrastructure, or fiscal or natural resources.

In addition, these constraints, related to the evaluation process, limit the evaluation teams' effectiveness:

1. The delay between the time when reports are due and when quantitative data are returned.
2. The necessarily short length of time for site visits.
3. The diverse goals of the individual programs.
4. The length of time needed to enter and analyze quantitative data.
5. Projects' perhaps limited ability to track participants after their involvement with the project ends.
6. Participation levels and missing data: all grantees need to submit all requested materials for cross-program comparisons to be possible.

Goals of this evaluation

An effective evaluation of these interventions (projects) will (from J. Gillies):

- assess program accomplishments as measured against specific objectives;
- preserve the historical record;
- document institutional accountability; and
- provide and guide recommendations for current and future program strategies.

## Developing the Evaluation Criteria

To establish a broader context for developing the evaluation criteria for this process, we consulted the following documents for guidance:

- *Development training II Project*, USAID/Egypt, HERNS, 7/24/95
- *Participant Training Project for Europe Final Report*, Aguirre International, 4/95
- *Strengthening the Human Capacity Development Strategy of El Salvador*, HERNS, no date
- *Draft Training for Development Results Package*, HERNS, 6/27/95
- USAID *Draft Directives*, 5/23/95
- *USAID/Senegal Assessment of the Development Impact of Participant Training*, Amex International, Inc., 9/95.

We've concluded from these documents that evaluation of training quality should focus on these general qualities: a program's relevance to the participants' needs (which incorporates issues of usefulness and applicability), its ability to generate a “multiplier effect” (i.e., that a participant's experience influences his/her colleagues, supervisor, or work environment.), the context in which the training occurs and is applied (the intervening variables, for example), and the level of the partner institution's continued support for a program.

Beyond looking for these general qualities, the evaluation model must be able to adapt to the nuances of individual program's goals. Criteria must be tailored to the expectations being applied by the Agency to this particular project, and then to the expectations stated by the individual projects, themselves.

## Agency objectives

USAID's larger re-engineering process focuses its efforts on strategic objectives promoting "sustainable development...economic and social growth [that] does not exhaust local resources or damage the economic, cultural or natural environment."[3]

USAID's objectives for Europe and the New Independent States (ENI) are4:

- to develop competitive, market-oriented economies in which the majority of economic resources are privately owned and managed;
- to help develop democratic political systems;
- to develop transparent and accountable governance;
- to empower indigenous civic and economic organizations that ensure broad-based participation in political life; and
- to provide assistance toward redefining public and private sector roles in the management of humanitarian, health, and related social services fundamental to a stable transition.

The first of those objectives provides the framework for the MTEE program's purpose: to develop the technical, management, and economic skills necessary to reconstruct Central and Eastern European economies and to develop competitive markets and businesses.5 The original goal of the program was to have a "visible and immediate impact through the quick delivery of training programs. The secondary objective is to develop sustainable counterpart institutions' programs through such vehicles as the training-of-trainers, course and material development."6

### MTEEP objectives

The RFA for the MTEE project states more specifically that the grantees should:

- rapidly transfer practical know-how to implement market economies to as many individuals in Central Europe as possible, and
- upgrade the capability of counterpart institutions to independently sustain such training and education programs on their own.

Additional USAID expectations for the project are that:

- counterpart institutions should be high quality organizations with the potential to become centers of excellence in the proposed field;
- training programs in management (academic and professional) should meet the training needs of front line managers, executives and other important groups in the transformation to market economies;
- impact will be evaluated in terms of a project's ability and effectiveness in reaching individuals who are key to the economic transformation;
- impact will also be evaluated in terms of a project's success in creating institutional capacity for self-sustaining training and educational programs.
- programs will increase the counterpart institution's ability to study and respond to the needs of the productive sector, create and implement programs to address those needs, and find innovative approaches to administration in order to adapt to the free market economy;
- the focus of the programs will be on management training and economics education taking place in Central and Eastern Europe;
- training-of-trainers will be a central element in each program;
- the minimum cost sharing target from grantees is that at least 40% of the proposed costs shall be supplied by the participating U.S. grantees, other donors, and/or CEE counterpart institutions.7

These objectives and expectations indicate that the monitoring and evaluation process for this project should focus on impact and sustainability (to be defined below).

---

USAID, *Phase I Customer Service Plan*, p. 3.

As stated in *Guide to doing business with the U.S. Agency for International Development*, pp. 17 - 18.

J. Klement, 7/14/94, *Action Memorandum for the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Europe and the New Independent States*, p. 1.

Ibid., p. 2.

RFA No. EE-94-A-002, p. 4.

Evaluation indicators

Indicators, the mechanisms by which we determine whether or not a program meets its objectives, must be linked to these objectives. In other words, there is no point counting the number of people attending a training session (an indicator) if specific participation rates (an objective) are not an issue.

From the above discussion, we have determined that impact and sustainability are the two primary objectives for which indicators are needed. These are nebulous concepts, difficult to quantify. Therefore, we will rely on both quantitative and qualitative indicators. We have conceptualized impact as occurring in four levels: acquisition of knowledge and skills, satisfaction with that acquisition, utilization of the knowledge and skills, and change in behavior at the individual, institutional and, ultimately, the environmental levels. Sustainability can be thought of as occurring on three levels: the programmatic, the organizational and the financial.

Successful impact for these programs should look like:

- participants attain skills, knowledge and abilities
- program operates at or near capacity
- content and materials are directly relevant to local need
- content is directly applied: change occurs at the individual/institutional level
- there is a high demand for the offerings
- program is cost-efficient
- program reaches critical mass of decision makers/influencers
- participants and staff report observable behavioral change (one measure is that participants return for additional programs)
- program is responsive to local needs (scheduling, course offerings)
- program delivers what it promises
- program has access to necessary resources to support it
- train-the-trainer programs focus on both content and delivery

Programs that are less successful would be characterized by:

- irrelevance of content and materials
- lack of organization and communication within program administration
- program is poorly attended
- "graduates" have a low employment rate (independent of economic conditions)
- there is a high drop out rate from the program (due to motivation, cost or irrelevance)
- programs are too basic or too advanced for local needs

A successfully self-sustaining program:

- has a strategic plan for curriculum development, funding, faculty regeneration, marketing, enrollment management and post-program placement efforts
- has administrative procedures for admissions, marketing, fund raising and internal operations
- is locally managed
- is known to the local business, academic and government communities
- is financially self-sustaining, independent of this USAID grant
- has a self-evaluation mechanism that applies findings to operations
- has sufficient human and material resources
- has viable alumni and other student associations
- has faculty and alumni involved in local/national/international issues and organizations

Sources of Information

The evaluation teams plan on tapping the following sources of information in their efforts to assess impact and degree of sustainability:

- Participants/participants
- Faculty: local/US in country
- Project staff: local, US in country, and US based in US
- Local businesses
- Local government officials
- Local USAID officials
- Embassy officials
- Donors and potential donors
- Peace Corps volunteers

Information gathering techniques may include:

Document gathering and analysis:

- research/personal libraries
- grantee materials and reports
- host institution materials
- USAID materials (local and DC)
- Documents available on the Internet
- Press

Observations

Interviews:
- structured/unstructured
- groups/individuals

Questionnaires

Databank Queries (PTMS or other system)

The RFA states that these quantitative indicators may be used:
To measure impact:
- number of courses by subject area
- number of participants by gender and professional area
- student contact hours
- student ratings of course/programs

To measure sustainability:
- number of educators/trainers trained
- specific curriculum development accomplished
- program development (new courses/degrees) implemented
- financial development (new funding sources) achieved
- quality control systems implemented

The RFA states that additional evaluative comparisons may be used:
- activities planned vs. accomplished (impact)
- counterpart ratings of the program (impact and sustainability)
- cost sharing achieved (sustainability)
- cost per output unit achieved (sustainability)
- projected vs. achieved financial disbursements (sustainability)

As these indicators measure only a few of the levels discussed above, we have added several indicators suggested by the other evaluation reports noted. These are included in the table which follows.

General Approach

| Process | Timing |
|---|---|
| Document review | On-going |
| Observation | Site visits (1- 2 x year) |
| Interviews | |
| Routine: faculty, participants, Project Directors, AID-mission, host inst. | Site visits (1-2 x year) |
| Later: Employers. potential employers past participants | Site visits (1-2 x year) |
| Questionnaires | |
| *Formal:* | |
| Participants | After every program |
| Project Director | Every 6 months |
| Host Director | Every 6 months |
| *Informal:* | |
| Project Director | Pre-site visit, post site visit |
| Local business/institutions | As needed via internet |
| Participants and employers | As needed via internet |
| Databank Queries | Every 6 months or as needed |

Below are our proposed, general evaluation indicators and tools.  Where relevant, these indicators would be applied to each grantee with the following question in mind: did the grantee achieve its stated objectives?

| IMPACT LEVEL | PROPOSED INDICATORS | DATA SOURCES | DATA COLLECTION METHODS | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Question-naire | Interview | Doc. Review | Database Query | Obser-vation |
| Acquisition | Participants attain skills, knowledge and confidence in subject matter | participants (sample or population), instructors | x | x | | | |
| | Courses reflect equitable distribution of participants (by gender, age, geographic region, management level) | participants, instructors | | | | x | |
| | Partners achieve effective distribution of programs by geographic region | project director, participants | | x | x | | |
| | Degree of program difficulty reflects local abilities and needs | local businesses, participants | | x | | | |
| | Target number of courses developed | project director | | | x | | |
| | Target number of courses introduced | project director | | | x | | |
| | Target number of participants reached | project director | | | x | | |
| | Faculty is prepared to deliver regionally relevant programs | participants, faculty | x | x | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Satisfaction | Student ratings of program positive | participants | x | x | | | |
| | Faculty ratings of program positive | faculty | x | x | | | |
| | There is a high demand for the program | project director, local businesses | | x | x | | |
| | Program is responsive to local needs (scheduling and course offerings) | local USAID staff, faculty | | x | | | |
| Utilization | Participants use skills and knowledge in work | participants | x | x | | | |
| | Participants' coworkers are impacted positively by knowledge and skills | participants, coworkers, employers | x | x | | | |
| | Employee/employer contact is facilitated (career days) | project director | | | x | | |
| | Placement resources provided (resource library) | project director | | | x | | |

| IMPACT LEVEL | PROPOSED INDICATORS | DATA SOURCES | Questionnaire | Interview | Doc. Review | Database Query | Obser-vation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Change | Participants' coworkers enroll in subsequent courses | participants | x | x | | | |
| | Participants' organizational unit performance improves | employer, participants | | x | | | |
| | Policy changes result at organization | employer, participants | | x | | | |
| | Policy changes result at sector/national level | embassy officials, local government and businesses | | x | | | |
| | Professional associations are formed | project director, local businesses and government officials | | x | x | | |
| | Faculty and alumni are involved on local/national/ international issues and organizations | participants, project director | | x | x | | |

| SUSTAINABILITY LEVEL | PROPOSED INDICATORS | DATA SOURCES | DATA COLLECTION METHODS | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Question-naire | Inter-view | Doc. Review | Database Query | Obser-vation |
| **Programmatic:** General support is sufficient for high quality program delivery | Local faculty is well trained and its teaching is well received | Project director, US faculty, local faculty, participants | X | X | X | X | X |
| | Relevant and useful curriculum has been developed, refined and implemented; supporting materials have been developed including case studies and texts. | Project director, US faculty, local faculty, participants | X | X | X | X | X |
| | Academic programs are institutionalized and appear in relevant course catalogues, etc. | Faculty, Project director | | X | X | | |
| | Necessary facilities, computer and support equipment are available. | Project director, US faculty, local faculty, and staff, and participants | X | X | X | | |
| **Organizational** All necessary procedures and policies are established and effectively implemented | Advisory board membership has balance of US and local participation. | Project director, local staff, board members | | X | X | | X |
| | Partnership relationships are equitable, and are being nurtured | Project director, US faculty, local faculty, and staff, local govt. and agency staff | | X | X | | |
| | Admissions process/procedures are developed and result in equitable selection of high quality participants. | Project director, US faculty, local faculty, and staff, participants, local govt. and USAID staff | | X | X | | |

| LEVEL | PROPOSED INDICATORS | DATA SOURCES | Question-naire | Inter-view | Doc. Review | Database Query | Obser-vation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Student recruitment/outreach process effectively creates large pool of qualified potential participants. | Project director, US faculty, local faculty, and staff, participants, local employers, govt., and USAID staff | | X | X | | |
| | Program marketing approach developed and implemented such that program is well known and respected within academic, business and government communities, and community perceptions/needs are monitored. | Local employers, local faculty, local staff | | X | X | | |
| | Self-evaluation mechanisms are developed and implemented; findings are applied to operations. | Project director, local staff | | X | X | | |
| | Project management converts from US-controlled to locally controlled staff. | Project director, local staff | | X | X | | |
| | Long range strategic plans are developed, implemented, evaluated and revised. | Project director, US faculty, local faculty, and staff | | X | X | | |

| LEVEL | PROPOSED INDICATORS | DATA SOURCES | Question-naire | Inter-view | Doc. Review | Database Query | Obser-vation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Financial: Funding sources and procedures permit the program to run independently of this USAID grant | Ratio of administrative to programmatic costs is balanced. | Project director, local staff | | X | X | | |
| | Tuition and fees policies are established (where appropriate); collection mechanisms are established and operating | Project director, local staff | | X | X | | |
| | Cost-sharing responsibilities are locally assumed and their ratio to USAID funding increases annually. | Project director, local staff and faculty | | X | X | | |
| | Mechanisms for securing alternative funding are established and implemented | Project director, local staff | | X | X | | |

Sample Instrument Items for Implementation Phase

**Data gathering method: Questionnaire**
**Data source: Participants (immediately at the conclusion of a program)**

In addition to gathering demographic information, the Participant Questionnaire may ask the following questions:

- To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (Likert scale, 5-1; strongly agree to strongly disagree)
- The quality of instruction was excellent
- The instructional materials were relevant to my work experiences and needs
- The instructor used examples that were relevant to my needs
- The course met my expectations
- The content of the program was too basic for my needs
- I would recommend this program to other interested people from my area

2. As a result of your participation in this program, have you received: (yes/no)
- greater professional skills?
- exposure to professional contacts?

3. As a result of your training, what contributions are you now prepared to make upon returning to your organization/job? (checklist)
- manage a new project, office, division or company
- initiate new projects or services
- improve operational procedures, programs or services
- influence or make company policy
- train others (workshops, on-the-job training)
- participate in research activities
- did not return to a specific organization or job
- other (explain)

4. Was this program explicitly intended to help you train others? (yes/no)

5. Was the program relevant to the situation and challenges in your own occupation in your country? (Likert scale: 1-5, “not at all” to “completely”)

6. What else might have made this program more useful or relevant to your needs?

Drafts of sample questionnaires for the Project Director and the Director from the Partner Institution, to be completed every 6 months, appear in the pages following this document.

A draft of the Financial Data Form, to be submitted every 6 months, appears in the pages following this document.

Sample Instrument Items for Follow-Up Phase

**Data gathering method: Questionnaire**
**Data source: Past Participants**

The following are possible questions to be used in interviews with past participants:

- To what extent are the skills and knowledge you gained from the program applicable to your current job? (5 point scale: very applicable...not applicable at all)

- Did you acquire skills that were useful to you in your work? (yes/no)

- If yes, which skills?

- Please provide an example of a situation in which the training should have been useful in your job and either was or was not.

- How much are you able to use the knowledge and skills learned from your program in your current job? (5 point scale: large amount...not at all)

- With approximately how many people in your organization have you shared your new skills, knowledge and attitudes? (fill in the blank: ____(#) in formal training sessions; ____ (#) informally

- As a result of your participation in this program, have you been able to propose or introduce new or improved (checklist: check all that apply)
- technologies, techniques, processes, procedures, systems
- projects, services, products
- design, implementation and evaluation approaches
- quality standards, quality assurance practices
- analysis and problem solving approaches
- supervisory, management, or leadership styles
- communication with colleagues, customers, donors...
- other (specify)

8. What was the degree of interest shown by your employer upon your return from program? (strong, moderate, weak)

**Data gathering method: Interview**
**Data source: Past participants**

The following are possible questions to be used in interviews with past participants:

- What is your assessment now of the quality of the program you attended?
- Who paid for your participation?
- If you were to go back in time, would you do it again?
- Did you acquire skills that are useful to you in your work?
- In what ways are you using the information from the program?
- In what ways has the program had an effect on your work performance?
- To what extent have your colleagues benefited from your participation in the program?
- What kinds of helpful business contacts, if any, were you able to make through the program?

**Data gathering method: Interview or Questionnaire**
**Data Source: Employers of past participants**

The following are possible questions to be used in interviews with employers of past participants:

- What is your business' purpose/mission?
- In what areas have the participants (and your employees) helped improve your business' ability/capacity in:
- Leadership, management and technical performance
- Policy development and /or analysis
- Corporation strategic planning
- Developing and/or implementing quality standards
- Developing and/or implementing management systems (operations, information systems, supervision, financial, personnel, training/staff development)
- Establishing/improving communications with clients, customers, donors
- Improving maintenance and use of facilities and/or equipment

- To what extent do you think the program has increased the demand for services/products at your business?
-

- To what extent have your participant/employees shared their new skills with other employees?
-

- In what other ways has your business benefited from the program, if at all?
-

- In what ways does your business help participant employees apply their new skills and knowledge?
-

- Would you continue to send employees to the programs?
-

- What changes in the programs would help increase the impact of training?
-
-